

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the present application in view of the foregoing amendments to the pending claims and the following remarks.

Amendments to the Claims and Specification

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 7-8, 10-12, 15, and 17-27 will be pending in the present application. Claims 7, 10, and 15 have been amended. Claims 13-14 and 16 have been cancelled herein. Claims 17-27 have been added.

No new matter has been added by way of these amendments because each amendment is supported by the present specification. For example, support for the recitations in claim 7 can be found in claims 13-14 and 16 as well as in the present specification, *inter alia*, at pages 11-14 and 65. Support for the recitations in claim 10 can be found in the present specification, *inter alia*, at page 37. Support for new claim 17 can be found in the present specification, *inter alia*, at page 38. Support for new claims 18-24 can be found in the present specification, *inter alia*, at page 53. Support for new claim 25 can be found in the present specification, *inter alia*, at page 72. Support for new claim 26 can be found in the present specification, *inter alia*, at page 57. Support for new claim 27 can be found in the present specification, *inter alia*, at pages 37 and 53.

The specification has been amended to replace the phrase “an aryl group” with the phrase “an allyl group.” The specification describes the aryl group as a polymerizable group. However, the aryl group is not a polymerizable group. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the phrase “an aryl group” is a typographical error of the phrase “an allyl group.”

Based upon the above considerations, entry of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and allow the currently pending claims.

Issues under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

1) Claims 7-8, 10-11, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al. '173 (U.S. 6,426,173) in view of Shibuya et al. '541 (U.S. 2003/0077541). Although the Office Action also recites Okazaki et al. '011 (U.S. 2004/0247011) in this rejection, the Examiner confirmed that this reference was inadvertently included in a telephone conversation on January 6, 2009.

2) Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al. '173 and Shibuya et al. '541 further in view of Okazaki et al. '011.

Applicants respectfully traverse. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested based on the following considerations.

As recited in independent claim 7, the present invention performs the development step with friction. In stark contrast, Shimizu et al. '173 perform a development step on a printing machine by using plate cylinder pressure while soaking in fountain solution (col. 13, lines 26-67). As such, Shimizu et al. '173 do not disclose each and every aspect of claim 7, and claims dependent thereon. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Shibuya et al. '541 nor Okazaki et al. '011 overcome the deficiencies of this reference. Moreover, the developer used by Shibuya et al. '541 has a pH value of 10, which falls outside the scope of claim 7.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be disclosed by the cited references. As discussed above, Shimizu et al. '173 in combination with the other cited references fail to disclose all of the claim limitations of independent claim 7, and those claims dependent thereon. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

For the reasons given above, the combination of references does not render the present invention obvious because the cited references or the art as a whole do not disclose at least one feature of the present invention and its effects. Furthermore, the cited references or the knowledge in the art provide no reason or rationale that would allow one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the present invention as claimed. Any contentions of the USPTO to the contrary must be reconsidered at present.

Applicants have newly added claims 17-27 in an effort to further define the scope of protection owed to Applicants. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 17-27 are allowable for the reasons given above. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 17-27 clearly define over the cited references, and an early action to this effect is earnestly solicited.

A full and complete response has been made to all issues as cited in the Office Action. Applicants have taken substantial steps in efforts to advance prosecution of the present application. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance issue for the present case.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

By Marc S. Weiner
 Marc S. Weiner
 Registration No.: 32,181
 BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
 8110 Gatehouse Road
 Suite 100 East
 P.O. Box 747
 Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
 (703) 205-8000
 Attorney for Applicants